

*Legislation  
file*

Excerpt from Journal

Office of the Legislative Counsel

Wednesday - 17 August 1960

STAT  
STAT

3. [redacted] Colonel Grogan advised that discussion [redacted] mentioning the provision in that revelation of the existence of the contract was punishable under U. S. law by a \$10,000 fine or ten years imprisonment had prompted newspaper inquiries. Apparently Justice has already pointed out this is the espionage statute which has no effect outside the U. S. and its admiralty and maritime jurisdiction and on the high seas. I pointed out we were well aware of this and had worked actively with Justice and the Congress on this since there was a bill to correct this situation - H. R. 1992 - but the matter had gotten confused because of the Omnibus Amendments to the Internal Security Act.

group of professional men who are not included in social security. It is my hope, that, perhaps, on the floor of the Senate during this week the law may be amended to include them. It would be a rebuke to the clique at the head of the American Medical Association. More than that, it would afford proper recognition of the fact that all self-employed men and women, in any profession or in any line of work, should be included; that our social security system should be made universal and apply to all self-employed persons, in addition to persons who are employees.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Ohio was most gracious in his reference to me.

Permit me to say that while the Senator from Ohio was serving as president of his bar association, he did an outstanding job in educating the lawyers of his State on the benefits available under social security and how the benefits compared to the price to the lawyer.

Prior to that time, most lawyers had not realized that, from an insurance point of view, there was available two, or perhaps four, times as much protection under social security as under private insurance plans. As the Senator from Ohio then pointed out to us on the committee, he saw to it that lawyers were appointed to study both sides, and to conduct a debate, and to show both sides of the argument. I believe the result was that at a meeting attended by a great number of lawyers in his State, the lawyers—including the two who had debated on the side against coverage—voted unanimously in favor of coverage. The Senator from Ohio knows as well as I do that those who had been assigned the duty of collecting the facts against coverage and presenting them and taking that side of the argument would be very likely to realize that the overwhelming argument favored coverage.

The junior Senator from Louisiana was one of those who told the doctors, on occasion, that he would not vote to have them placed under social security unless and until they were prepared to accept it. If and when the doctors of my State or the majority of the doctors of the Nation make it clear that they are ready for coverage under the social security system, I am prepared to vote for such coverage for them.

But certainly in the past on the committee I have taken the attitude that I was not prepared to vote for coverage for the doctors until they indicated they favored it. I felt it would be better to leave things the way they were until the doctors became sufficiently educated about the matter to take a stand similar to that taken by the lawyers, who have desired coverage under social security—particularly after they better understand the cost—as compared to the benefits. I believe that eventually that will be the case insofar as the doctors are concerned; but it will take a little time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Senator from Louisiana in making the statement he has just made.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana certainly manifests great intelligence and an excellent recollection. Attending, as he has, so many meetings of the Senate Finance Committee over the years, and being regarded as one of the hardest working members of that committee, it strikes me as unusual when he recalls the fact that the bar association of which I was president did, indeed, hold a referendum. We held a debate on the subject of whether lawyers should be included within the provisions of the social security system; and following that debate—where the usual arguments were made, such as "state socialism," and "socialized medicine," our association and the lawyers of Ohio did vote overwhelmingly in favor of being covered by the social security system. Approximately 70 or 80 percent of them were in favor of joining the social security system; and the Cuyahoga Bar Association, of which I was then president, voted unanimously to ask the Congress to include self-employed lawyers within the social security system. We were included.

Now, Mr. President, the physicians and surgeons of the country have likewise evidenced, whenever a poll has been taken, their wish to be included. Certainly the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and I agree that they will be included, regardless of whether they are actually included this year.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, whom I hold in the highest admiration and respect, that I realize full well that he, likewise, wants our social security system to be applied universally—to all employed and all self-employed, regardless of their occupation or profession. I realize that he, too, is insistent that the system remain actuarially sound—as do all thoughtful citizens.

Mr. President, a moment ago I referred to the position now being taken by the American Medical Association in regard to having doctors and surgeons covered by the social security system. Mr. President, it is my belief that this antiquated and reactionary organization does not speak for the great majority of doctors who desire to be included under the Act and who have publicly expressed this desire in polls and otherwise. In fact, it speaks only for a small group of willful doctors who have the time to devote to its activities, rather than to practicing medicine.

Mr. President, insofar as amendments to the Social Security Act are concerned, this bill, while not fully satisfactory, is at least an improvement upon existing legislation.

It is my fervent hope that we shall accept the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and thereby have a truly realistic program under a streamlined and up-to-date social security system.

Mr. President, I have taken more time than I intended to take on this subject. At this point let me express, finally, my

very fervent hope that the Senate, when it votes later in the week, will vote, accept the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. It is also my hope that we will add other amendments which will improve and expand this great system, of which all of us are so proud; and that, as the end result of our efforts during this session of Congress, we shall pass and send to the White House a truly realistic act which will provide an up-to-date social security program, actuarially sound. Such a bill will take care of the elderly men and women of the Nation and women who no longer are able to be gainfully employed. In particular it will take care of them when the calamity of unexpected, prolonged illness or of hospitalization and surgical care comes into their homes, because, Mr. President, we believe that colossal debt should not be the penalty that American men and women should have to pay when these tragedies occur.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With objection, it is so ordered.

*H.R. 1940*  
NEED OF LEGISLATION GIVING SECRETARY OF STATE POWER WITHHOLD PASSPORTS TO PERSONS ENGAGED IN COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. President, in the past several weeks have heard quite a bit about the need for the passage of certain pieces of legislation which are deemed in some quarters to be urgent. Nowhere in such however, have I seen any reference bill which is now on the Senate Calendar and which has actually been in urgent category for the past 2 years.

I am referring to Calendar No. 1, a bill—S. 2652—to strengthen the internal security of the United States. It is difficult to understand, particularly in view of the stepped up war of propaganda and subversion directed against this country by international communism, why there should continue any delay in enacting this or similar legislation.

The specific need for legislation of this nature is brought about by a decision of the Supreme Court on June 16, 1954. That decision held that State Department regulations denying passports to Communists or persons assisting Communist movement were not valid because of the lack of specific legislative authority for them. The purpose of this legislation is to make that authority clear.

S. 2652, which was introduced a year ago by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], contains a provision which I believe is particularly needed in these days of mounting pressures against the free world by the Communist conspiracy. That section would permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons connected with the Communist Party or persons who have engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. There should no longer be any doubt in the mind of anyone what the purpose of the Communist conspiracy is. We need look no farther than Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, and the propaganda trial of one of our citizens in Moscow right now, to see the varied workings of this international plot. This bill would serve as an effective means of reducing the ability of the Communists to carry out their conspiratorial missions, while at the same time it contains adequate safeguards to prevent the reckless administration of such power.

Last year the House of Representatives, for the second time since the 1958 Supreme Court decision, passed a bill (H.R. 9069) which is perhaps not as broad as the Senate bill. It does, however, accomplish essentially the same purpose in affirming the right of the Secretary of State to withhold passports from persons engaged in Communist activities. The House bill—passed in the House of Representatives on September 8, 1959—came over to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it remains. I sincerely regret that the committee, of which I am a member, has not seen fit to act on this most important piece of legislation.

As I mentioned earlier, however, we do have on the Senate Calendar the Keating-Dodd bill, which was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 30, 1960. It is a bill that should be promptly placed on this list of must legislation and brought before the Senate for action.

Last Monday the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] made an excellent presentation on this floor in favor of such legislation. At that time he inserted in the Record an analysis of the bill, a summary of congressional activity in this field since the 1958 Supreme Court decision regarding passport powers of the Secretary of State, and a statement which outlines very clearly the urgent necessity for passage of S. 2652. These matters appear on pages 15229 and 15230 of the Record of August 15, 1960.

Mr. President, it seems completely inconceivable to me that we should allow to continue a situation wherein the most bitter enemies of this country and our democratic institutions are given this Government's blessing to conduct their dirty business under the protective shield of a U.S. passport. No one is naive enough to presume that the passage of this legislation will eliminate the Communist threat to our country. But it will make it more difficult for the Communists and their agents to go about their business of subversion, espionage, and spying.

If there is any legislation this Nation really needs from this session of Congress, it is this.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, as has been stated, on June 16, 1958, the U.S. Supreme Court passed on the State Department regulations denying passports to Communists.

Only a few days later, on July 7, after the decision was printed and the matter researched, the President of the United States delivered a message to the Congress. His request was followed by the introduction on the ensuing day of a bill by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], then a Member of the House.

More than 2 years have elapsed. For the life of me, I cannot understand why we have not enacted this or similar legislation.

As the Senator from Delaware has said, Senate bill 2652, which was introduced nearly a year ago, contains a section which would permit the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons suspected of sympathizing with the Communist movement. I think all of us are agreed that there is now no question about the extent of Communist activity. Cuba, the Congo, and what is happening in the Berlin area are examples of the inroads which have been made.

The House last year passed for the second time a bill which empowers the Secretary to withhold passports from persons engaged in communistic operations. That bill, H.R. 9069, came to the Senate; but if my memory serves me correctly, the bill is still in the foreign relations committee.

But the Keating-Dodd bill, S. 2652, was reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee last June 30. In my opinion, this bill constitutes "must" legislation for this session of the Congress. Certainly we should do everything possible to hinder agents of the Soviet Government in the conduct of its subversive and espionage activities in this country.

That bill will go a long way toward doing it, and I am hopeful that the measure can be passed during this session of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on August 15, my distinguished senior colleague, Senator Hruska, spoke to the Senate with expert knowledge on the necessity for enacting, during the current session, S. 2652, a bill giving to the Department of State effective control over passports which are now being issued to known Communists and Communist supporters. His profound effort in this matter, as a very able member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, eminently qualifies him to serve notice on this body that we must act, that we must act now. Demands for the enactment of this bill are not partisan. They have been made by deeply concerned colleagues on both sides of the aisle. These Senators are keenly aware, as am I, that a gaping hole in our dike of defense needs to be plugged at once—failure to act finds us grievously derelict.

We know that, since 1958, repeated efforts have been made to correct this abasement of a great American privilege. Members of both parties have in-

troduced legislation for correction and have diligently sought enactment. The President has repeatedly asked the Congress to take action. Excuses for inaction will not be palatable at home if we leave here and, by inaction, sign a death warrant to S. 2652.

Are we so naive to believe that travelers from behind the Iron Curtain have unlimited access to Soviet passports? Can we not accept the fact that Soviet administrators will let no one but the most hardened and seasoned Communists travel West? Have we not witnessed, repeatedly, accounts of tight surveillance over Soviet diplomatic personnel by secret police because of the psychotic fear of defection, of importing knowledge of Russian activities? Yet, blithely, we permit hundreds of Communists and their kindred spirits to trek to Moscow and report on matters most vital to our defense and our security. If any of us feel it necessary to offer an apology to Khrushchev for some American deed, is this not more logical than some which have been suggested?

Veterans of Nebraska—veterans of World War I, World War II and Korea have asked this Congress to tone down the politics of this session long enough to send S. 2652 to the President. I urge the leadership of this body to heed their call. Let us take this opportunity, at this session, to make a move which all Americans will applaud.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly hope the majority leader will have time to schedule this bill for action and I join with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and others in urging its immediate approval.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12580), the social security amendments of 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is there pending any amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this bill has been fully debated. This is the second day it has been under consideration. If no Senator wishes to offer an amendment, I am wondering why we cannot proceed to the disposition of this bill by having the third reading.

We hear rumors that some Senators who had amendments printed may have decided not to offer those amendments. Some of these amendments that are at the desk have been submitted by Senators on both sides of the aisle; but if there is no disposition on the part of their sponsors to offer them I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM		
UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	INITIALS	DATE
1	<div></div>		
2	221 East Bldg.		
3			
4			
5			
6			
	ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
	APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
	COMMENT	FILE	RETURN
	CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE

Remarks:

Returned for your files.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.

DATE

O/DCI/mfb

9/22/60